

Lye, Linda. (2014). *STINGRAYS: The Most Common Surveillance Tool the Government Won't Tell You About*. American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, *available at* https://www.aclunc.org/sites/default/files/StingRays\_The\_Most\_Common\_Surveillance\_Tool\_the\_Govt\_Won %27t\_Tell\_You\_About\_0.pdf (last accessed: Jan. 4, 2016).

Note: PDF pp. 1-4 (title page and table of contents) attached.



## STINGRAYS

The Most Common Surveillance Tool the Government Won't Tell You About

A Guide for Criminal Defense Attorneys

FROM THE ACLU OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA





Photo credit: US Patent & Trademark Office

Author: Linda Lye, Senior Staff Attorney, ACLU of Northern California

Cover: Gigi Pandian, ACLU of Northern California

**Design:** Carey Lamprecht

Published by the ACLU of Northern California, June 27, 2014

The author wishes to thank Nanci Clarence, Josh Cohen, Catherine Crump, Hanni Fakhoury, Carey Lamprecht, Robin Packel, Mindy Phillips, and Nate Wessler for reviewing and commenting on drafts of this paper, and Christopher Soghoian for providing an eye-opening education on IMSI catchers. Special thanks go to Daniel Rigmaiden for his keen insights on legal and technological issues and for shedding light on this important issue.



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTR	RODUCTION1						
II.	Sting	gRays: What do they do and how do they work?						
III.	What kind of court authorization, if any, does the government currently obtain to use the device?							
	A.	No court authorization?	4					
	B.	Pen register/trap and trace order?	.5					
	C.	lybrid Order?6						
	D.	Warrant?	7					
IV.	What	hat guidance have courts offered on StingRays?						
V.	How can you tell if the government used a StingRay in your case?9							
	A.	Terminology						
	B.	How did the government find out your client's cell phone number? 1						
	C.	How did the government locate your client?	0					
VI.	Key legal arguments to raise if an IMSI catcher was used							
	A.	IMSI catchers trigger Fourth Amendment scrutiny	1					
		1. Use in connection with residences	1					
		2. Use in public	2					
	B.	IMSI catchers engage in the electronic equivalent of a "general search" and their use therefore violates the Fourth Amendment						
	C.	Statutory orders do not suffice to authorize IMSI catcher use						
	D.	Even if the government obtained a warrant, use of an IMSI catcher is still invalid						
		The government's omission of information about new surveillance technology from a warrant application prevents courts from exercising their constitutional oversight function and would render a warrant invalid						

## 

		1	b.	A defendant is entitled to a <i>Franks</i> hearing	18
		2.		rant that accurately describes an IMSI catcher's capabilities be facially invalid	
VII.	CONC	CLUSIO	N		22
APPE	NDIX:	Issues t	o Pursu	e in Discovery	23
FNDN	OTES				28